IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE SEVENTEENTH DAY OF JANUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE R.SUBHASH REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO: 10517 of 1994

Between:

1 Inti Durgayya, S/o. Late Sattayya.
R/o. Gudepuvalasa, Bhogapuram Mandal,
Vizianagaram.
2 Inti Appayya, S/o. Late Sattayya.
R/o. Gudepuvalasa, Bhogapuram Mandal,
Vizianagaram.

..... PETITIONERS

AND

1 The Mandal Revenue Officer, Bhogapuram Mandal,
Vizianagaram.
2 The Revenue Divisional Officer, Vizianagaram.
3 The Joint Collector, Vizianagaram.
4 Smt.Datla Satyavathamma, W/o. Late Appalaraju.
Gudepuvalsa Village, Bhogapuram Mandal,
Vizianagaram.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a Writ more in the nature of Certiorari or any other appropriate Writ order or orders quashing the order dated 1-6-1994 cancelling the 'D' Form Patta (Issued on 21-09-1978) by the M.R.O. and declare the said order as illegal and violative of Articles 14 of the Constitution of India.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.A.K.V.JOGINAIDU

Counsel for the Respondents 1 to 3: GP FOR REVENUE

Counsel for the Respondent No.4: SRI C.PRAVEEN KUMAR

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

On 17.09.2004, Sri C.Praveen Kumar, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners, who is on record, submitted that Sri Jogi Naidu, who has also filed vakalath on behalf of the petitioners, is not practicing and hence, the file is not available with him. In that view of the matter, this Court has passed an order directing the office to issue notices to the petitioners. In pursuance of the same, notices were sent, but the notice was served on the first petitioner and so far as the second petitioner is concerned, the same was returned unserved with postal acknowledgment “Addressee expired”. Though the first petitioner was served with notice, when the matter is taken up for hearing today there is no representation on his behalf.

In that view of the matter, the writ petition is dismissed for non-prosecution. No order as to costs.

_____ R.SUBHASH REDDY, J

17.01.2005

DR

To

1 The Mandal Revenue Officer, Bhogapuram Mandal,
Vizianagaram.
2 The Revenue Divisional Officer, Vizianagaram.
3 The Joint Collector, Vizianagaram.
4 2CCs to Government Pleader for Revenue, High Court Buildings, Hyderabad.
(OUT)

5 2CD copies